

MORALE BOOSTER

the official organ of

U NITED F OR O UR E XPANDED S PACE P ROGRAMS

Volume II Number 3

August 1975

Table of Contents

Article	Page
I. Finance and Fortune	2
II. Voices From The Outside World	4
III. Progress Is Our Most Important Product	7
FLASH BULLETIN	8
IV. Stimulus/Response: September 10, 1975	9

Copyright (c) 1975 United For Our Expanded Space Programs

except excerpts from:

- San Francisco Chronicle Copyright (c) 1975 San Francisco Chronicle
- The Los Angeles Times Copyright (c) 1975 Los Angeles Times
- Astronomy Copyright (c) 1975 AstroMedia Corp.
- Time Copyright (c) 1975 Time, Inc.
- Newsweek Copyright (c) 1975 Newsweek, Inc.
- The National Enquirer Copyright (c) 1975 National Enquirer

National and Editorial Offices
Post Office Box 7807
San Diego, California 92107

Antares Chamber
6575 Picasso Road Suite #3
Isla Vista, California 93017

I. Finance and Fortune

When the question of economics has been discussed in these pages in the past, the focus of our remarks has centered on the economic implications of an expanded space program for the nation as a whole. Interwoven in the discussions have been considerations relating to the ways in which the economic arguments for space exploration and exploitation can be most efficaciously presented to the space-policy makers. Although we clearly recognize the existence of many non-economic rationales for expanding the country's space activities, we concentrate our energies on full development of the financial aspects of such a policy because economics is not only the strongest basis of support for an expanded space program but is also the sort of conservative, realistic and no-nonsense perspective which is difficult for space opponents, accustomed to dealing with more abstract and nebulous supporting evidence, to counter effectively. This is not to say that the task is easy. There are many subtleties to even so prosaic a matter as money; and to use economic arguments incisively requires an adeptness not gained without much study and thought. In a certain sense, we must all become economists; for our opponents are not without their resources and, though they may be disconcerted initially by our financial attack, they will not be dispersed and, consequently, will return to the offensive on the low ground of profits and losses. The initial skirmishes will easily be ours; but the battle will not be decided in our favor until, and unless, we prepare our ideational weapons (tools, for the less militaristic reader) in depth. There is much work here but it is essential that it be done thoroughly and properly. None of us can afford to shirk our responsibilities in this often dry and hard realm of finance and fortune.

The economic question is not solely an abstract one, is not solely a matter of governmental revenues over which we have no direct control or influence. We exist and operate within a capitalist society which, for better and worse, is shaped by the interplay of monetary forces. Although economic factors such as natural resources, regulatory agencies, capital goods, and benefices arising from private connections between public representatives and private entrepreneurs play important roles in the continuing formation of society, the day-to-day functioning of that society is based upon the exchange of goods and services for money. Access to the forums where expression of new or old ideas is possible is determined by money. Access to the tools necessary to produce the artifacts of persuasion is determined by money. All the prerequisites to change within the culture are subject to purchase. Thus, the question of the financial aspects to an expanded space program is not confined to the intricacies of the effects of spending billions on utilization of the space environment but also extends to the rather mundane considerations of U.F.O.E.S.P.'s day to day 'living expenses'.

Before we enter upon the detailed discussion of finances for the organization, it is imperative that the reader understand that these remarks are not intended as a plea for contributions although, if the reader becomes moved by the force of the remarks to present U.F.O.E.S.P. with a monetary gift, we would encourage him or her to entertain the impulse to the fullest degree. What we hope to achieve here is an explication of the financial underpinnings to our work which will establish in the reader's understanding a clear image of how our work is furthered and constrained by financial considerations. This is not to say that such pleas will never be made; only that one will not be made now. It should also be emphasized that these remarks do not constitute a formal financial report for United For Our Expanded Space Programs. Such a report will be presented in Morale Booster (November or after) by the Treasurer at the conclusion of the fiscal year.

The expenses of the organization fall into three primary categories at this time: postage; printing; and organizational expenditures. The last category, comprising such things as the service charges for the bank account, copyright fees, post office box rentals, etc., is the least of the three. The remainder of our costs is more or less equally divided between postage and printing expenses. However, the biggest expense for the moment, considering only the work that is being done now, is by far postage, an expense which will increase by a third by the end of this year due to the postal increases in the offing. For example, to print 700 copies of a petition consisting of three pages requires \$35 to \$40. To mail those same petitions requires \$70 to \$85 (calculating the expense at the proposed higher postal rates). In the case

opponents, accustomed to dealing with more abstract and nebulous supporting evidence, to counter effectively. This is not to say that the task is easy. There are many subtleties to even so prosaic a matter as money; and to use economic arguments incisively requires an adeptness not gained without much study and thought. In a certain sense, we must all become economists; for our opponents are not without their resources and, though they may be disconcerted initially by our financial attack, they will not be dispersed and, consequently, will return to the offensive on the low ground of profits and losses. The initial skirmishes will easily be ours; but the battle will not be decided in our favor until, and unless, we prepare our ideational weapons (tools, for the less militaristic reader) in depth. There is much work here but it is essential that it be done thoroughly and properly. None of us can afford to shirk our responsibilities in this often dry and hard realm of finance and fortune.

The economic question is not solely an abstract one, is not solely a matter of governmental revenues over which we have no direct control or influence. We exist and operate within a capitalist society which, for better and worse, is shaped by the interplay of monetary forces. Although economic factors such as natural resources, regulatory agencies, capital goods, and benefices arising from private connections between public representatives and private entrepreneurs play important roles in the continuing formation of society, the day-to-day functioning of that society is based upon the exchange of goods and services for money. Access to the forums where expression of new or old ideas is possible is determined by money. Access to the tools necessary to produce the artifacts of persuasion is determined by money. All the prerequisites to change within the culture are subject to purchase. Thus, the question of the financial aspects to an expanded space program is not confined to the intricacies of the effects of spending billions on utilization of the space environment but also extends to the rather mundane considerations of U.F.O.E.S.P.'s day to day 'living expenses'.

Before we enter upon the detailed discussion of finances for the organization, it is imperative that the reader understand that these remarks are not intended as a plea for contributions although, if the reader becomes moved by the force of the remarks to present U.F.O.E.S.P. with a monetary gift, we would encourage him or her to entertain the impulse to the fullest degree. What we hope to achieve here is an explication of the financial underpinnings to our work which will establish in the reader's understanding a clear image of how our work is furthered and constrained by financial considerations. This is not to say that such pleas will never be made; only that one will not be made now. It should also be emphasized that these remarks do not constitute a formal financial report for United For Our Expanded Space Programs. Such a report will be presented in Morale Booster (November or after) by the Treasurer at the conclusion of the fiscal year.

The expenses of the organization fall into three primary categories at this time: postage; printing; and organizational expenditures. The last category, comprising such things as the service charges for the bank account, copyright fees, post office box rentals, etc., is the least of the three. The remainder of our costs is more or less equally divided between postage and printing expenses. However, the biggest expense for the moment, considering only the work that is being done now, is by far postage, an expense which will increase by a third by the end of this year due to the postal increases in the offing. For example, to print 700 copies of a petition consisting of three pages requires \$35 to \$40. To mail those same petitions requires \$70 to \$85 (calculating the expense at the proposed higher postal rates). In the case of an issue of Morale Booster, restricting our considerations to issues that are sent to the entire membership, the printing comes to approximately \$5.25 (for 50 copies; lessening the number of copies would not greatly affect the cost of printing) while the postage amounts to \$3.60 (for 18 copies). There is also the costs of correspondence to consider, although it is not a large part of the postage as yet, which has been averaging \$.75 per month. One might also add to the printing costs, in the case of the petition example given above, \$7 or \$8 for envelopes. One must also remember that such costs as the Aussiecon Programme Book Advertisement (\$40), the printing of 5,000 bumper stickers (\$300), and the delegation memberships to science-fiction conventions (somewhat less than \$50) are not included in the three primary classes of expenses.

The income of U.F.O.E.S.P. is of two sorts: memberships and donations. At this time, the majority of our funds come from donations. There are 18 members currently with seven of them being active and the remainder passive. This means that the total sum of memberships is \$194.89, insufficient to cover the cost of the bumper stickers. The donations have totaled at least \$550. Currently, there is

somewhat less than \$20 in the treasury. As the membership grows, the necessity for donations will diminish. The memberships are designed with the future in mind; if the memberships were structured now so that they alone could bear the financial burden of our work, they would be so expensive that we would be unable to enlist new members. However, if the membership numbered a few hundred persons, then the need for donations would be greatly diminished, if not nonexistent. It is obvious what must be done: proselytize!

We live in a capitalist society. The opening paragraphs might be colloquially expressed as "money talks". The previous paragraph, and the remarks to follow, might be formulated as "it takes money to make money." The fundamental task of any beginning enterprise in a capitalist system is the accumulation of capital which is then used to invest in the program of production seen by the entrepreneur(s) as leading to the desired profits. We must be judicious in our applications of such abstruse economic theory with reference to our work as the enterprise in which we are engaged, the Space Revolution, and the profits we seek to realize, colonization of the solar system (which, we must add, is only the beginning), are not programs which are limited in effect or focus as any classical capitalist enterprise must necessarily be. Nonetheless, there are lessons for us in such analogies because the psychological realities associated with a capitalist system and the general procedures by which that system operates shape every activity within it. Thus, the principles that money talks and that it takes money to make money have profound meaning for U.F.O.E.S.P.'s labors even though they are directed to ends which transcend the system represented by the principles in question. We have briefly reviewed the first of the two principles; now our attention is turned to the second.

Until July, the primary concern of the organization was the political work necessary to generate an increased commitment to space efforts. What energies were directed to increasing the membership and to creating the organizational structure essential for channeling conservatively (in the sense of 'conservation') the organization's resources to the political ends were done so only to the extent necessitated by circumstance to insure continuance of the main work. With the dissemination of the first two petitions, the preparation of the Third, the completion of our initial efforts to make common cause with other space-oriented groups, and the finalizing of the plans for the Fall Media Campaign, the primary concern of U.F.O.E.S.P. must become the enlargement of the membership. (In a certain sense, all our work is political for every contact between the organization and the outside world, be it directed to proselytization, propaganda, education or structural creation, requires presentation of our views and promulgation of our doctrines, in however limited a fashion. However, the character of such contacts, or expressions of our position, are quite different from one situation, from one case, to another.) Growth in our numbers is vital both for the political weight it will provide and for the financial resources which will accrue to the organization as a consequence. What we seek to create with our shift to proselytization from propaganda is the beginning of a positive feedback cycle: more members will generate more money will generate more political activity will generate more members which will generate more money will generate more political activity will generate more members will generate more....

In order to gather new personnel, United For Our Expanded Space Programs must present itself in a direct and convincing manner to the public, no matter the size of the audience. Four basic situations are open to us: (a) the organization as a whole addresses the public as a whole; (b) the organization as a whole addresses the public as a part; (c) the organization as a part addresses the public as a whole; and (d) the organization as a part addresses the public as a part. There are two basic procedures by which these situations may be worked to increase members: (1) advertising; and (2) personal persuasion. It is clear that advertising, though applicable in all the situations enumerated, would be directed primarily towards (a) and (b) while personal persuasion, though applicable to the last two, would be directed essentially to (d). The advantage to personal persuasion lies in its basic inexpensiveness since, theoretically, one might simply go into the streets and address any gathering of people that happens to be there. The advantages to advertising are the diversity of audience and the selectivity of approach open to one, since the media provide the means to overcome the limitations of time, space and talent possessed by

ing to the desired profits. We must be judicious in our applications of such abstruse economic theory with reference to our work as the enterprise in which we are engaged, the Space Revolution, and the profits we seek to realize, colonization of the solar system (which, we must add, is only the beginning), are not programs which are limited in effect or focus as any classical capitalist enterprise must necessarily be. Nonetheless, there are lessons for us in such analogies because the psychological realities associated with a capitalist system and the general procedures by which that system operates shape every activity within it. Thus, the principles that money talks and that it takes money to make money have profound meaning for U.F.O.E.S.P.'s labors even though they are directed to ends which transcend the system represented by the principles in question. We have briefly reviewed the first of the two principles; now our attention is turned to the second.

Until July, the primary concern of the organization was the political work necessary to generate an increased commitment to space efforts. What energies were directed to increasing the membership and to creating the organizational structure essential for channeling conservatively (in the sense of 'conservation') the organization's resources to the political ends were done so only to the extent necessitated by circumstance to insure continuance of the main work. With the dissemination of the first two petitions, the preparation of the Third, the completion of our initial efforts to make common cause with other space-oriented groups, and the finalizing of the plans for the Fall Media Campaign, the primary concern of U.F.O.E.S.P. must become the enlargement of the membership. (In a certain sense, all our work is political for every contact between the organization and the outside world, be it directed to proselytization, propaganda, education or structural creation, requires presentation of our views and promulgation of our doctrines, in however limited a fashion. However, the character of such contacts, or expressions of our position, are quite different from one situation, from one case, to another.) Growth in our numbers is vital both for the political weight it will provide and for the financial resources which will accrue to the organization as a consequence. What we seek to create with our shift to proselytization from propaganda is the beginning of a positive feedback cycle: more members will generate more money will generate more political activity will generate more members which will generate more money will generate more political activity will generate more members will generate more....

In order to gather new personnel, United For Our Expanded Space Programs must present itself in a direct and convincing manner to the public, no matter the size of the audience. Four basic situations are open to us: (a) the organization as a whole addresses the public as a whole; (b) the organization as a whole addresses the public as a part; (c) the organization as a part addresses the public as a whole; and (d) the organization as a part addresses the public as a part. There are two basic procedures by which these situations may be worked to increase members: (1) advertising; and (2) personal persuasion. It is clear that advertising, though applicable in all the situations enumerated, would be directed primarily towards (a) and (b) while personal persuasion, though applicable to the last two, would be directed essentially to (d). The advantage to personal persuasion lies in its basic inexpensiveness since, theoretically, one might simply go into the streets and address any gathering of people that happens to be there. The advantages to advertising are the diversity of audience and the selectivity of approach open to one, since the media provide the means to overcome the limitations of time, space and talent possessed by any particular person. We must employ both methods, but personal persuasion is a slow process while advertising requires serious monetary outlays. To proselytize directly an individual will require hours to days, providing one has a sympathetic listener. To proselytize through the media requires tens of dollars to hundreds, providing one chooses forums carefully. Although we must make use of every opportunity for personal persuasion which appears, we must also expect that there will be a small number of these opportunities in these initial stages. Consequently, we must realize that advertising will be the method on which we will concentrate until the membership is considerably larger. The Aussiecon Advertisement is a start; but it is the very beginning and we will need to do much more of this work before we can hope to shift our major energies elsewhere.

Finance and fortune: the fortunes of our efforts to increase our membership will be determined, to the greatest extent, by the finances we devote to them.

II. Voices From The Outside World

"It may not be the sexiest name for a perfume but EPAS has a few other things going for it, not the least of which is a zillion dollars worth of free publicity. Among its super-powerful sponsors is General Gherman Titov, the premier Russian cosmonaut who did the christening. EPAS is an acronym for Experimental Project Apollo-Soyuz. The fragrance--actually a concentrated cologne that will retail in the United States at \$10 for 2 1/4 ounces--was created to commemorate the first cooperative manned space flight. A limited edition of 200,000 bottles will go on sale in leading stores in the U.S., the Soviet Union and half a dozen key international markets on July 15, the day that the space project will be simultaneously launched from Cape Canaveral and from Baikonur in the desert of Kazakhstan. Everything about EPAS was as jointly managed as the space flight. Revlon, Russia's chosen partner in the venture, designed and produced the packaging and promotion in New York. The essential oils came out of the Novaya Zarya (New Dawn) factory in Moscow. The background information kit from Revlon's public relations department describes the scent as a 'delicate mixture of Oriental-floral blends with an unusual balance of lavender, citrus and spice. There are touches also of sandalwood and musk.' An American scholar of Soviet Affairs sniffed EPAS and pronounced it characteristically Russian, 'Sweet and cloying.'" The San Francisco Chronicle, Page 14, July 3, 1975, from the New York Times.

"It is now clear that men and women have the ability to live and work in space; it is also clear that they desire to do so. This has all been proved by our manned space program--and by the Russians'. Now, with the Apollo-Soyuz rendezvous program, it is clear that men and women of different nations and ideologies are willing to cooperate in space. There is a hope that space and technology will be used for the betterment of man and his earth--a hope that permeates most peoples of the world, to which I can attest from my travels as an astronaut. Fortunately, the resources required to use space as a contributor to earthly affairs are very modest, particularly when compared to other activities with much less obvious returns. Indeed, it is now possible and appropriate to predict the eventual existence of the institutions of civilization in space, perhaps by the beginning of the next century. By then we could be receiving large amounts of energy from solar power plants in synchronous orbit about the earth. We can have titanium mines and refineries on the moon. In large space stations, we can be manufacturing high-purity metals, nearly perfect crystals, special biomedical materials and other items that can take advantage of the weightlessness and vacuum of space. Large scientific observatories in earth-orbit or on the moon can be interpreting the new and revolutionary views of the sun and the universe available outside the earth's atmosphere. All of these 'dreams' are now possible. We even can conceive now of international schools and universities in space where students of all disciplines from the physicist to the doctor to the poet will be participating in a new era of learning. However, in spite of the promise of all these dreams, let us not fool ourselves. The frontier of space has moved out beyond the moon to the surface of . . . Mars. On Mars are focused the dreams of the young scientific and humanistic adventurers among us today. On Mars we see the opportunity to meld the new understanding of the moon and the old questions about our earth into a final unraveling of the history of our planet. Most important, on Mars lies mankind's next opportunity to rejuvenate his civilization as it was rejuvenated in the New World 200 years ago. We should not forget the historical importance of the contribution of our ancestors when they planted the seeds of freedom anew on the American continents. Similar importance will be attached some day to the permanent colonization of Mars. We should not be hesitant to move deliberately in that direction. An examination of history and common sense indicates that when a people focuses too much attention on the details of living--when the tendency is to look inward--a balancing, outward-looking force is needed. Poverty, Vietnam, Watergate, inflation, recession and pollution are--or have been--words and problems that of necessity have forced our attention inward. Space is a world and opportunity that inherently forces our attention outward. We can sense the need for such a balance in our personal lives as well as see it in the histories of older societies and nations. As the balance for Roman society lay in conquest, and as the balance for

the venture, designed and produced the packaging and promotion in New York. The essential oils came out of the Novaya Zarya (New Dawn) factory in Moscow. The background information kit from Revlon's public relations department describes the scent as a 'delicate mixture of Oriental-floral blends with an unusual balance of lavender, citrus and spice. There are touches also of sandalwood and musk.' An American scholar of Soviet Affairs sniffed EPAS and pronounced it characteristically Russian, 'Sweet and cloying.'" The San Francisco Chronicle, Page 14, July 3, 1975, from the New York Times.

"It is now clear that men and women have the ability to live and work in space; it is also clear that they desire to do so. This has all been proved by our manned space program--and by the Russians'. Now, with the Apollo-Soyuz rendezvous program, it is clear that men and women of different nations and ideologies are willing to cooperate in space. There is a hope that space and technology will be used for the betterment of man and his earth--a hope that permeates most peoples of the world, to which I can attest from my travels as an astronaut. Fortunately, the resources required to use space as a contributor to earthly affairs are very modest, particularly when compared to other activities with much less obvious returns. Indeed, it is now possible and appropriate to predict the eventual existence of the institutions of civilization in space, perhaps by the beginning of the next century. By then we could be receiving large amounts of energy from solar power plants in synchronous orbit about the earth. We can have titanium mines and refineries on the moon. In large space stations, we can be manufacturing high-purity metals, nearly perfect crystals, special biomedical materials and other items that can take advantage of the weightlessness and vacuum of space. Large scientific observatories in earth-orbit or on the moon can be interpreting the new and revolutionary views of the sun and the universe available outside the earth's atmosphere. All of these 'dreams' are now possible. We even can conceive now of international schools and universities in space where students of all disciplines from the physicist to the doctor to the poet will be participating in a new era of learning. However, in spite of the promise of all these dreams, let us not fool ourselves. The frontier of space has moved out beyond the moon to the surface of . . . Mars. On Mars are focused the dreams of the young scientific and humanistic adventurers among us today. On Mars we see the opportunity to meld the new understanding of the moon and the old questions about our earth into a final unraveling of the history of our planet. Most important, on Mars lies mankind's next opportunity to rejuvenate his civilization as it was rejuvenated in the New World 200 years ago. We should not forget the historical importance of the contribution of our ancestors when they planted the seeds of freedom anew on the American continents. Similar importance will be attached some day to the permanent colonization of Mars. We should not be hesitant to move deliberately in that direction. An examination of history and common sense indicates that when a people focuses too much attention on the details of living--when the tendency is to look inward--a balancing, outward-looking force is needed. Poverty, Vietnam, Watergate, inflation, recession and pollution are--or have been--words and problems that of necessity have forced our attention inward. Space is a world and opportunity that inherently forces our attention outward. We can sense the need for such a balance in our personal lives as well as see it in the histories of older societies and nations. As the balance for Roman society lay in conquest, and as the balance for British society lay on the seas, so the balance for the history of man lies in space." The Los Angeles Times, Part II, Page 5, July 15, 1975, by Harrison H. Schmitt.

"The results of an experiment sent to Mars aboard a Soviet spacecraft in 1971 have sparked new speculations about the exact nature of the atmosphere of that most Earthlike planet. Prior to the February 1974 announcement of the Soviet results, the Martian atmosphere . . . was believed to consist almost entirely of carbon dioxide. Now, sparked by the Soviet report, new interpretations suggest significant amounts of the gas argon is present in the Martian atmosphere. If accurate, the finding would mean Mars is much more like Earth than currently thought. The 1971 Soviet exploration of Mars consisted of four spacecraft--two intended to orbit the planet and two landing vehicles. Only Mars 6, one of the landers, was successful in returning new information although it ceased to function just before reaching the Martian surface. The critical data were obtained on the way down through the atmosphere, according to Joel E. Levine of NASA's Langley Research Center. 'During the parachute phase of the Mars 6's descent, the ion pump of the mass spectrometer . . . started its

evacuation,' Levine said, 'To the surprise of the Russian scientists, the ion pump did not evacuate as it did in laboratory simulations in a pure carbon dioxide atmosphere. One obvious explanation was that the instrument malfunctioned.' A second possibility according to Levine was that large amounts of an unexpected inert gas (such as argon) could not be pumped out of the instrument. Since it is not easily ionized, argon is a very difficult gas to pump out of a mass spectrometer. The initial reaction of the scientific community to the Soviet report was one of scepticism . . . The instruments had indicated that 1/3 of the Martian atmosphere is argon, a totally unexpected result difficult to reconcile—at least at first. Then in a November 1974 article in Geophysical Research Letters, Levine and Guenter R. Riegler . . . described a model of Martian argon production based on the 'radiogenic decay of potassium-40 in the Martian interior'. Their calculations indicate that 'several tens of percent of argon are possible, and should be expected in the Martian atmosphere.' The Levine-Riegler calculations predict an argon abundance of about 28 percent. Interestingly, a 1947 calculation by Harrison Brown . . .—based on the same reasoning—also predicted that argon may be a major constituent of the Martian atmosphere. . . . Lewis Kaplan of the University of Chicago has examined some recent high resolution Mars carbon dioxide spectra . . . Preliminary analysis . . . by Kaplan does indeed suggest 'several tens of percents' of argon in the Martian atmosphere. In 1971, Donald Hunten of Kitt Peak National Observatory reported that the total pressure measurement of the Martian atmosphere deduced by the Mariner radio occultation method is consistent with either a pure carbon dioxide atmosphere or with various mixtures such as 80 percent carbon dioxide, and either 20 percent argon or 20 percent nitrogen. Levine believes the presence of several tens of percent of argon has very important implications. . . . Levine estimates that about 50 million times as much water than now appears in the Martian atmosphere was once outgassed on Mars. There should also be about 500 times more carbon dioxide than we now see [he] says. The Levine estimate provides the carbon dioxide that Carl Sagan . . . has suggested is trapped in the summer north polar cap . . . , and that Fraser P. Fanale and William A. Carron of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory have suggested is physically adsorbed to the Martian surface regolith. However, the large quantity of water predicted by Levine . . . is very difficult to reconcile with current estimates of surface and subsurface permafrost and water physically adsorbed and chemically bound to the surface regolith. Yet the presence of large amounts of liquid water on Mars sometime in the past may explain the intriguing surface features resembling meandering dried river beds complete with tributary systems photographed by Mariner 9. The prediction that large amounts of water outgassed on Mars coupled with the Mariner 9 surface photographs . . . suggest that Mars may have somehow lost the equivalent of Earth's oceans. Another possibility is that large amounts of as yet undiscovered water exist on Mars. The biological implications of such large amounts of water on Mars past or present are very important. . . ." Astronomy, Pages 61 and 63, July, 1975.

"Seen by millions of earth-bound television viewers against the dark background of space, the deliberate, exquisitely choreographed ballet of the two spacecraft looked like something out of Stanley Kubrick's 1968 film 2001. Gliding silently 140 miles high over the Atlantic, the U.S. Apollo made its slow, gingerly approach to the beetle-shaped Soviet Soyuz, whose features appeared so clearly on TV screens that sunlight could be seen glinting off its winglike solar panels. Then came the slight bump as the two ships, now somewhere over the North Atlantic, made contact. 'We have succeeded!' Apollo Commander Tom Stafford exulted in awkward Russian. Replying in English, Soyuz's skipper Aleksei Leonov exclaimed, 'Soyuz and Apollo are shaking hands. Good show!' With that simple exchange, the Apollo and Soyuz crewmen celebrated an impressive technological achievement: the first rendezvous and docking of spacecraft of two different nations. Next on the agenda was a round of high-altitude, high-budget diplomatic theater carefully scripted for maximum political impact. . . . Stafford and Slayton crawled into the Soyuz and shook hands and exchanged bear hugs with Leonov and his fellow crewman, Valery Kubasov. Then they traded gifts . . . After some small talk the four, plus Astronaut Vance Brand back in Apollo, sat back to listen to greetings from their national leaders. Soviet Party Chief Leonid Brezhnev, in a message relayed by mission controllers outside Moscow, hailed the meeting in space as marking a 'new page in the history of research.'

cent. Interestingly, a 1947 calculation by Harrison Brown . . .—based on the same reasoning—also predicted that argon may be a major constituent of the Martian atmosphere. . . . Lewis Kaplan of the University of Chicago has examined some recent high resolution Mars carbon dioxide spectra . . . Preliminary analysis . . . by Kaplan does indeed suggest 'several tens of percents' of argon in the Martian atmosphere. In 1971, Donald Hunten of Kitt Peak National Observatory reported that the total pressure measurement of the Martian atmosphere deduced by the Mariner radio occultation method is consistent with either a pure carbon dioxide atmosphere or with various mixtures such as 80 percent carbon dioxide, and either 20 percent argon or 20 percent nitrogen. Levine believes the presence of several tens of percent of argon has very important implications. . . . Levine estimates that about 50 million times as much water than now appears in the Martian atmosphere was once outgassed on Mars. There should also be about 500 times more carbon dioxide than we now see [he] says. The Levine estimate provides the carbon dioxide that Carl Sagan . . . has suggested is trapped in the summer north polar cap . . . , and that Fraser P. Fanale and William A. Carron of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory have suggested is physically adsorbed to the Martian surface regolith. However, the large quantity of water predicted by Levine . . . is very difficult to reconcile with current estimates of surface and subsurface permafrost and water physically adsorbed and chemically bound to the surface regolith. Yet the presence of large amounts of liquid water on Mars sometime in the past may explain the intriguing surface features resembling meandering dried river beds complete with tributary systems photographed by Mariner 9. The prediction that large amounts of water outgassed on Mars coupled with the Mariner 9 surface photographs . . . suggest that Mars may have somehow lost the equivalent of Earth's oceans. Another possibility is that large amounts of as yet undiscovered water exist on Mars. The biological implications of such large amounts of water on Mars past or present are very important. . . ." Astronomy, Pages 61 and 63, July, 1975.

"Seen by millions of earth-bound television viewers against the dark background of space, the deliberate, exquisitely choreographed ballet of the two spacecraft looked like something out of Stanley Kubrick's 1968 film 2001. Gliding silently 140 miles high over the Atlantic, the U.S. Apollo made its slow, gingerly approach to the beetle-shaped Soviet Soyuz, whose features appeared so clearly on TV screens that sunlight could be seen glinting off its winglike solar panels. Then came the slight bump as the two ships, now somewhere over the North Atlantic, made contact. 'We have succeeded!' Apollo Commander Tom Stafford exulted in awkward Russian. Replying in English, Soyuz's skipper Aleksei Leonov exclaimed, 'Soyuz and Apollo are shaking hands. Good show!' With that simple exchange, the Apollo and Soyuz crewmen celebrated an impressive technological achievement: the first rendezvous and docking of spacecraft of two different nations. Next on the agenda was a round of high-altitude, high-budget diplomatic theater carefully scripted for maximum political impact. . . . Stafford and Slayton crawled into the Soyuz and shook hands and exchanged bear hugs with Leonov and his fellow crewman, Valery Kubasov. Then they traded gifts . . . After some small talk the four, plus Astronaut Vance Brand back in Apollo, sat back to listen to greetings from their national leaders. Soviet Party Chief Leonid Brezhnev, in a message relayed by mission controllers outside Moscow, hailed the meeting in space as marking a 'new page in the history of research.' President Ford, sitting in front of a TV camera at his desk in the Oval Office, spoke with the crewmen directly. In the nine minutes he took to applaud the flight . . . and interview the five men . . . , the linked spacecraft . . . traveled all the way across the Soviet Union. Their first act of . . . detent out of the way, the astronauts and cosmonauts settled down to other activities. . . . By the time the spacecraft parted company on Saturday, the two teams of spacemen had spent some 44 hours linked together. As Apollo pulled away, it blotted out Soyuz's view of the sun, creating an artificial solar eclipse that the cosmonauts photographed for astronomers. The ships then redocked briefly in a retest of the docking system, but this time the hatches remained closed. Before long the ships separated for the last time. As Soyuz pulled ahead under a gentle thrust from its rockets, the spacemen bade each other a final radio farewell. 'Mission accomplished,' said Leonov. 'Good show,' said Stafford. . . . Was the mission really worth its cost, which came to about \$225 million each for the U.S. and the Soviets? The Soviet leadership seems to have no doubts. . . . Similarly, the Ford Administration . . . seemed convinced that the

big space trip was worth it. But other Americans . . . may wonder whether the Soviets simply got a free guide to superior U.S. technology. Not so, says NASA Deputy Administrator George Low. He insists that it was the U.S. that learned a technological lesson from the Russians, rather than vice versa. . . . Low says the joint mission exposed designers of the sophisticated Apollo system to the functional simplicity of less costly Soviet space hardware. . . . 'We have to learn not to overdo things when they don't have to be overdone.' The Soviet bent for simplicity, however, may not continue for long. For scientific as well as political and military reasons, the Russians can be expected to step up their space effort, launching up to six manned flights a year. After several explosions, they may also make a new effort to send up their huge G-1-6 booster, which is even larger than the U.S. Saturn 5. If it works, the Russians could use it to erect a large space station, set up lunar bases and perhaps send off manned voyages to other planets. . . ." Time, Pages 32, 35 and 36, July 28, 1975.

". . . Slightly ahead of schedule, TV viewers saw Soyuz shudder a bit. 'Contact,' announced the Apollo skipper gleefully. 'Capture. We also have a capture.' Then Stafford switched to Russian. 'My spravilis' ('We have succeeded'), he declared. 'Soyuz and Apollo are shaking hands now,' Leonov proclaimed in English. 'My soglasny' ('We agree'), replied Stafford. . . . The thrill was clearly shared by two other spacemen. Soyuz 18 cosmonauts Pyotr Klimuk and Vitaly Sevastyanov, orbiting more than 80 miles higher in their Salyut-4 space station, radioed their congratulations to the two teams on the docking, offered to provide any instructions the teams needed for making repairs, and swapped fish stories with Leonov. Their enthusiasm was hardly surprising. After seven weeks in orbit, the Salyut crew had settled into a tedious routine of exercise and experiment, which included tending a zero-gravity garden of peas and onions. The attention of the rest of the world, however, remained focused on the two cosmonauts and three astronauts who had fleetingly broken through national barriers in space. . . . Even before the flight had ended, during a press conference from space last week, the crewmen pronounced their own verdict on the success of the mission. 'Perhaps,' said Brand, 'we will be exploring the planets together in twenty years.' . . ." Newsweek, Page 42, July 28, 1975 by Peter Gwynne with Alfred Friendly, Jr., William Schmidt and Louis Alexander (emphasis added).

"The Soviet Soyuz spacecraft returned Monday from its docking mission with the U.S. Apollo in a perfect, even spectacular, touchdown in a Kazakhstan desert. Cushioning rockets were fired when the Soyuz was about 5 to 7 feet above the ground--to cut its speed from 13 m.p.h. to under a half mile per hour--sending up great clouds of sand smoke. The landing produced long anxious 'Oohhs' from television viewers on Gorki St. in Moscow. The touchdown was about six miles from the predicted target, 35 miles from the town of Arkalyk and about 300 miles from the Baikonur Space Center. The accuracy impressed NASA officials here. It was well within normal deviation, even for Apollo, they said, and was particularly good in view of the 22-m.p.h. wind in the area. Soyuz is suspended by parachute for twice as long as Apollo . . . and thus is likely to drift more during descent. Television cameras on helicopters picked up the Soyuz, with its billowing red-and-white parachute, as soon as it came through the clouds in the central Asian sky, then following it down, providing excellent live coverage of the landing and recovery. It was the first Soviet spaceship landing seen by the Russian public, either live or on film, although they have seen Apollo splashdowns. . . . When the dust had settled, the bellshaped Soyuz was on its heat-scorched side. A rescue helicopter landed nearby within two minutes and helicopter crewmen opened the hatch of the craft. But no one emerged. The rescue team then rolled Soyuz about 15 degrees, reached in again and pulled out a black book, apparently the flight log. Pilot Alexei A. Leonov then wriggled out, followed by engineer Valery N. Kubasov. They were unsteady on their feet and, when the announcer mentioned it, one spectator retorted, 'You would be wobbly, too, comrade!' General laughter broke the tension. . . ." The Los Angeles Times, Part I, Page 1, July 22, 1975 by Robert C. Toth.

"Drifting lazily to earth under its canopy of three red and white parachutes.

". . . Slightly ahead of schedule, TV viewers saw Soyuz shudder a bit. 'Contact,' announced the Apollo skipper gleefully. 'Capture. We also have a capture.' Then Stafford switched to Russian. 'My spravilis' ('We have succeeded'), he declared. 'Soyuz and Apollo are shaking hands now,' Leonov proclaimed in English. 'My soglasny' ('We agree'), replied Stafford. . . . The thrill was clearly shared by two other spacemen. Soyuz 18 cosmonauts Pyotr Klimuk and Vitaly Sevastyanov, orbiting more than 80 miles higher in their Salyut-4 space station, radioed their congratulations to the two teams on the docking, offered to provide any instructions the teams needed for making repairs, and swapped fish stories with Leonov. Their enthusiasm was hardly surprising. After seven weeks in orbit, the Salyut crew had settled into a tedious routine of exercise and experiment, which included tending a zero-gravity garden of peas and onions. The attention of the rest of the world, however, remained focused on the two cosmonauts and three astronauts who had fleetingly broken through national barriers in space. . . . Even before the flight had ended, during a press conference from space last week, the crewmen pronounced their own verdict on the success of the mission. 'Perhaps,' said Brand, 'we will be exploring the planets together in twenty years.' . . ." Newsweek, Page 42, July 28, 1975 by Peter Gwynne with Alfred Friendly, Jr., William Schmidt and Louis Alexander (emphasis added).

"The Soviet Soyuz spacecraft returned Monday from its docking mission with the U.S. Apollo in a perfect, even spectacular, touchdown in a Kazakhstan desert. Cushioning rockets were fired when the Soyuz was about 5 to 7 feet above the ground—to cut its speed from 13 m.p.h. to under a half mile per hour—sending up great clouds of sand smoke. The landing produced long anxious 'Oohhs' from television viewers on Gorki St. in Moscow. The touchdown was about six miles from the predicted target, 35 miles from the town of Arkalyk and about 300 miles from the Baikonur Space Center. The accuracy impressed NASA officials here. It was well within normal deviation, even for Apollo, they said, and was particularly good in view of the 22-m.p.h. wind in the area. Soyuz is suspended by parachute for twice as long as Apollo . . . and thus is likely to drift more during descent. Television cameras on helicopters picked up the Soyuz, with its billowing red-and-white parachute, as soon as it came through the clouds in the central Asian sky, then following it down, providing excellent live coverage of the landing and recovery. It was the first Soviet spaceship landing seen by the Russian public, either live or on film, although they have seen Apollo splashdowns. . . . When the dust had settled, the bellshaped Soyuz was on its heat-scorched side. A rescue helicopter landed nearby within two minutes and helicopter crewmen opened the hatch of the craft. But no one emerged. The rescue team then rolled Soyuz about 15 degrees, reached in again and pulled out a black book, apparently the flight log. Pilot Alexei A. Leonov then wriggled out, followed by engineer Valery N. Kubasov. They were unsteady on their feet and, when the announcer mentioned it, one spectator retorted, 'You would be wobbly, too, comrade!' General laughter broke the tension. . . ." The Los Angeles Times, Part I, Page 1, July 22, 1975 by Robert C. Toth.

"Drifting lazily to earth under its canopy of three red and white parachutes, the Apollo spacecraft hit the gentle Pacific swells northwest of Hawaii just 4 1/2 miles off the bow of the recovery carrier New Orleans. The only visible problem aboard the craft as it returned from its historic space rendezvous . . . was minor. Some of the parachute shrouds caught on the Apollo's nose and capsized it; that left Astronauts Thomas Stafford, Vance Brand and Donald . . . Slayton hanging facedown from the straps holding them in their contour-fitted couches for several minutes until flotation balloons could right the capsule. But when they finally climbed out of the Apollo 45 minutes later, after it had been hoisted aboard the New Orleans, the astronauts appeared no more wan and weary than might be expected after a nine-day mission. They went through the traditional welcoming ceremonies, addressed the world from the carrier deck and took the obligatory call from the President. That, however, was the end of the post-landing celebrations. All further activities were cancelled, including a steak and lobster dinner, and NASA doctors began treating the three men for a potentially serious lung problem. Unknown to the watching world, the glowing hot Apollo had begun filling with what the astronauts described as a 'brownish-yellow gas' as it plunged through the 24,000-ft. level. Scarcely able to breathe

the spacemen choked through the harrowing four-minute descent. After the splashdown, they struggled for another five minutes, while suspended upside down in the capsized craft, to get at oxygen masks, stowed in a hard-to-reach spot behind their couches. Brand, whose mask fit poorly, passed out; he revived a minute or so later when Slayton and Stafford clapped the mask tightly over his face. As Navy frogmen swam toward the capsized spacecraft, Stafford yelled into his microphone, 'Get this [fuck]ing hatch open as soon as possible.' After a moment, he cracked the hatch open himself. Most of his words were lost in the poor radio communication between the ship and Mission Control, apparently because a microphone had been left open during the hurried efforts to revive Brand. By now aware of a problem, the frogman clambered onto the edge of the ship, peered into a window and gave a thumbs-up sign to reassure everyone that the astronauts were all right (sic). It was not until seven hours later that NASA officials in Houston began disclosing the full seriousness of the incident. . . . During their night aboard the carrier, the astronauts experienced considerable discomfort from coughing and were given cortisone in order to reduce lung inflammation. Next day when the carrier docked at Pearl Harbor, the three were driven to Honolulu's Tripler Army Medical Center. Waving and smiling as they walked into the hospital, the astronauts asked officials to reassure their wives back in Houston. . . . At week's end doctors expressed cautious optimism about the chances for recovery, moved the men from the hospital's intensive-care unit to a private VIP suite, and said that they probably would be flown home early this week. . . . The Kremlin promptly hailed the joint mission with yet another barrage of pronouncements. . . . The Russians had more reason to crow. At week's end the two cosmonauts who had been aloft in a Salyut space station all through the Apollo-Soyuz mission returned safely to earth after 63 days in space, a Soviet record. . . ." Time, Page 38, August 4, 1975 (emphasis added).

"Astronaut Donald K. . . . Slayton, who will undergo exploratory lung surgery next week, said Wednesday he hoped to be out of the hospital within seven days, back to work in two weeks and on flying status again within a month. 'I feel great,' the 51-year-old Slayton said at a news conference in which he was asked about the operation and his health. Slayton said he was lucky the lesion found on one of his lungs was not discovered earlier—because 'I could have easily been jerked off the flight.' The astronaut had been grounded for 11 years with a heart ailment and was returned to flying status just in time to be assigned to the crew for the last space journey Americans will make for a number of years. He flew last month's Apollo-Soyuz mission with . . . Stafford and . . . Brand. . . . A nonsmoker since 1973, Slayton said he viewed the forthcoming operation this way: 'Well, I feel about the same way I do about having blood drawn. I don't like to do that either, but you do what you [must] when you have to do it and this isn't the first surgery I've undergone, so it doesn't bother me particularly. I'm not looking forward to it, obviously; I don't think anybody does. On the other hand, it's not bugging me, either. I figure I'm going to be out of there in about seven days and back to work in a couple of weeks. And I'm supposed to be back on flight status within a month.' The astronaut will enter the University of Texas M.D. Anderson Hospital and Tumor Institute [in Houston] . . . on Monday and will undergo surgery Tuesday morning. The lesion is in the lower part of Slayton's left lung. . . ." The Los Angeles Times, Part I, Page 8, August 21, 1975 by Nicholas C. Chriss.

"Astronaut Donald K. (Deke) Slayton, recovered from lung surgery, is continuing to show 'signs of improvement' and is in 'good spirits,' officials said Thursday." The Los Angeles Times, Part I, Page 28, August 29, 1975 from AP.

"Despite two launching cancellations, the first Viking landing vehicle may still touch down on Mars next July 4, in time for the nation's 200th birthday celebration, officials said Sunday. Because of movements of the planets, the first Viking spacecraft, if launched on the latest schedule of 2:22 p.m. PDT Wednesday, should go into orbit around Mars on June 19, 1976. That would only be three days behind the original schedule, even though the launching would have been 10 days late, a National Aeronautics and Space Administration spokesman said. [He] said the Viking was in 'extremely healthy' condition and should be ready for launching on schedule Wednesday. Scientists have allowed two weeks for the Viking to orbit

... During the night aboard the carrier, the astronauts experienced considerable discomfort from coughing and were given cortisone in order to reduce lung inflammation. Next day when the carrier docked at Pearl Harbor, the three were driven to Honolulu's Tripler Army Medical Center. Waving and smiling as they walked into the hospital, the astronauts asked officials to reassure their wives back in Houston. . . . At week's end doctors expressed cautious optimism about the chances for recovery, moved the men from the hospital's intensive-care unit to a private VIP suite, and said that they probably would be flown home early this week. . . . The Kremlin promptly hailed the joint mission with yet another barrage of pronouncements. . . . The Russians had more reason to crow. At week's end the two cosmonauts who had been aloft in a Salyut space station all through the Apollo-Soyuz mission returned safely to earth after 63 days in space, a Soviet record. . . ." Time, Page 38, August 4, 1975 (emphasis added).

"Astronaut Donald K. . . . Slayton, who will undergo exploratory lung surgery next week, said Wednesday he hoped to be out of the hospital within seven days, back to work in two weeks and on flying status again within a month. 'I feel great,' the 51-year-old Slayton said at a news conference in which he was asked about the operation and his health. Slayton said he was lucky the lesion found on one of his lungs was not discovered earlier—because 'I could have easily been jerked off the flight.' The astronaut had been grounded for 11 years with a heart ailment and was returned to flying status just in time to be assigned to the crew for the last space journey Americans will make for a number of years. He flew last month's Apollo-Soyuz mission with . . . Stafford and . . . Brand. . . . A nonsmoker since 1973, Slayton said he viewed the forthcoming operation this way: 'Well, I feel about the same way I do about having blood drawn. I don't like to do that either, but you do what you [must] when you have to do it and this isn't the first surgery I've undergone, so it doesn't bother me particularly. I'm not looking forward to it, obviously; I don't think anybody does. On the other hand, it's not bugging me, either. I figure I'm going to be out of there in about seven days and back to work in a couple of weeks. And I'm supposed to be back on flight status within a month.' The astronaut will enter the University of Texas M.D. Anderson Hospital and Tumor Institute [in Houston] . . . on Monday and will undergo surgery Tuesday morning. The lesion is in the lower part of Slayton's left lung. . . ." The Los Angeles Times, Part I, Page 8, August 21, 1975 by Nicholas C. Chriss.

"Astronaut Donald K. (Deke) Slayton, recovered from lung surgery, is continuing to show 'signs of improvement' and is in 'good spirits,' officials said Thursday." The Los Angeles Times, Part I, Page 28, August 29, 1975 from AP.

"Despite two launching cancellations, the first Viking landing vehicle may still touch down on Mars next July 4, in time for the nation's 200th birthday celebration, officials said Sunday. Because of movements of the planets, the first Viking spacecraft, if launched on the latest schedule of 2:22 p.m. PDT Wednesday, should go into orbit around Mars on June 19, 1976. That would only be three days behind the original schedule, even though the launching would have been 10 days late, a National Aeronautics and Space Administration spokesman said. [He] said the Viking was in 'extremely healthy' condition and should be ready for launching on schedule Wednesday. Scientists have allowed two weeks for the Viking to orbit Mars and take photographs of the planet's surface before detaching its landing vehicle for descent. Scientists want to be sure that the landing site . . . near the edge of the 3,000-mile-long Martian grand canyon—is safe before committing the vehicle to the landing. A second Viking is scheduled to drop its landing vehicle by means of parachutes and retrorockets to a place near the edge of Mars' north polar cap. Both landing vehicles will carry remote-control laboratories." The Los Angeles Times, Part I, Page 5, August 18, 1975 from UPI.

III. Progress Is Our Most Important Product

The future waits to be moved. With the resources to hand we commit ourselves to an unyielding pressure on the future. There is more space to be had and we shall have it! The legitimacy of our call is the power of history, the mechanics of evolution, the purpose of will and intention. We are not beyond reason; nay, we are implacable in our insistence on its necessity. To question the need for space is

to engage in idle chatter. Space speaks for itself. But we repeat them nonetheless; we drone on about the benefits to come and with us. Our method is spiraling intensity of public expression of the need for an expanded space program. We have cycles of growing intensity. We are red hot! The style is adolescent but the psychology is inevitable. We are whirling dervishes for space.

So much for the pep talk. Now it's down to business. The founding principle of our organization is unity, right? Unity among all those millions who stand in need of an expanded space program. It has been pointed out to the membership in various issues that there are many groups organizing for space. What might be accomplished by a convention or congress of all (many) of these groups? The time is propitious for agitation. There is much vaguery in the conceptualization of the plans. First, we need a regularized list of organizations' names and addresses. Let national headquarters be the processing center. Send in your information now. Then, after the list has been compiled, we prepare a program (tentative) and prepare an introduction of the idea to be sent to the prospective attendees. We would want to be flexible with the program but the focus should be on what we can do for space now. When and where it might be held are large questions. We might have it coincide with our attendance at MidAmericon. Robert A. Heinlein will be guest of honor. There will be a jam-packed convention. We must get crackin'. We want an impressive organization in 11 months. The Fall Media Campaign will be our big test. Nothing to panic about; but something to take quite seriously.

We eagerly await the Programme Book for Aussiecon to see the placement of our advertisement. As mentioned in the first article of this issue, advertising will play a greater part in our affairs as the tempo of the FMC picks up. We must carefully analyze the results of this first venture (we do not consider The Reader ads since we did not pursue the avenue vigorously). It is an expensive operation and we want to spend our money judiciously. We calculate that our advertisement will be seen at least five times by 1200 people. We fear to say what response rate we might expect but we can say that if we only receive 10 active memberships the ad will have paid for itself. For the future, we imagine Astronomy, Fantasy and Science Fiction, Analog, and the Futurist as markets for our solicitations. We will need great orchestration. The FMC will involve a greater number of elements than we have organized to date. There is great excitement here for those who take pleasure in bringing their creativity to bear on challenging social problems. Join the vanguard of the Space Revolution! We essentially appeal to the elite. We appeal to the Scotsman in every person.

****FLASH BULLETIN**FLASH BULLETIN**FLASH BULLETIN**FLASH BULLETIN**FLASH BULLETIN****

"Harrison H. (Jack) Schmitt, the first civilian scientist to walk on the moon, announced his candidacy Tuesday for the Republican nomination to the U.S. Senate from New Mexico." The LA Times, Page 32, Part I, September 10, 1975.

Dear reader, please re-read the article in this month's "Voices...." by Mr. Schmitt in which he puts forth the proposition that Mars marks the frontier of man's civilization. The Assistant President For Interorganizational Affairs has his base of operations in Socorro, New Mexico. This may be the biggest opportunity to date in the organization's history for potential for changing space policy in America. It is not clear to what extent and in what ways Mr. Schmitt and ourselves can be useful to one another. But it would not be to our disadvantage, insofar as we can tell, to have Mr. Schmitt in office. We must learn all we can about this man, his views, his prognosis of the future, his advisers, his finances, his communication channels. John Glenn already is in the Senate. Can you imagine the effect the last man to walk the Moon would have on that body? In both referents of the term! John Turney has publicly supported restoration of the Venus probe funds (this is the man who has recently reversed his stand on Federal Medical Health Plans and no longer supports the measures he once introduced). John Tower strongly backs NASA's programs. The FMC will be much underway by the end of the year: we should be in a potent position to make use of the political concentration and fixation of the country then. Dear friends! We must not let this opportunity pass!

the list has been compiled, we prepare a program (tentative) and prepare an introduction of the idea to be sent to the prospective attendees. We would want to be flexible with the program but the focus should be on what we can do for space now. When and where it might be held are large questions. We might have it coincide with our attendance at MidAmericon. Robert A. Heinlein will be guest of honor. There will be a jam-packed convention. We must get crackin'. We want an impressive organization in 11 months. The Fall Media Campaign will be our big test. Nothing to panic about; but something to take quite seriously.

We eagerly await the Programme Book for Aussiecon to see the placement of our advertisement. As mentioned in the first article of this issue, advertising will play a greater part in our affairs as the tempo of the FMC picks up. We must carefully analyze the results of this first venture (we do not consider The Reader ads since we did not pursue the avenue vigorously). It is an expensive operation and we want to spend our money judiciously. We calculate that our advertisement will be seen at least five times by 1200 people. We fear to say what response rate we might expect but we can say that if we only receive 10 active memberships the ad will have paid for itself. For the future, we imagine Astronomy, Fantasy and Science Fiction, Analog, and the Futurist as markets for our solicitations. We will need great orchestration. The FMC will involve a greater number of elements than we have organized to date. There is great excitement here for those who take pleasure in bringing their creativity to bear on challenging social problems. Join the vanguard of the Space Revolution! We essentially appeal to the elite. We appeal to the Scotsman in every person.

****FLASH BULLETIN**FLASH BULLETIN**FLASH BULLETIN**FLASH BULLETIN**FLASH BULLETIN****

"Harrison H. (Jack) Schmitt, the first civilian scientist to walk on the moon, announced his candidacy Tuesday for the Republican nomination to the U.S. Senate from New Mexico." The LA Times, Page 32, Part I, September 10, 1975. Dear reader, please re-read the article in this month's "Voices...." by Mr. Schmitt in which he puts forth the proposition that Mars marks the frontier of man's civilization. The Assistant President For Interorganizational Affairs has his base of operations in Socorro, New Mexico. This may be the biggest opportunity to date in the organization's history for potential for changing space policy in America. It is not clear to what extent and in what ways Mr. Schmitt and ourselves can be useful to one another. But it would not be to our disadvantage, insofar as we can tell, to have Mr. Schmitt in office. We must learn all we can about this man, his views, his prognosis of the future, his advisers, his finances, his communication channels. John Glenn already is in the Senate. Can you imagine the effect the last man to walk the Moon would have on that body? In both referents of the term! John Turney has publicly supported restoration of the Venus probe funds (this is the man who has recently reversed his stand on Federal Medical Health Plans and no longer supports the measures he once introduced). John Tower strongly backs NASA's programs. The FMC will be much underway by the end of the year: we should be in a potent position to make use of the political concentration and fixation of the country then. Dear friends! We must not let this opportunity pass!

****FLASH BULLETIN**FLASH BULLETIN**FLASH BULLETIN**FLASH BULLETIN**FLASH BULLETIN****

Soon the Third Petition will be written and distributed. The response to the Second Petition has been negligible but we are not daunted. Each statement of our principles and doctrines before the Legislative or Executive Power of the United States takes its toll. We must apply steady pressure. There will be moments when no effect of our efforts on the progress of this country will be determinable. It is then most crucial that we do not slacken our efforts! The Third Petition will speak of peace, will speak of co-operation in this bursting world. The United States Congress is sitting in judgment on the Sinai Peace Accord; the nation's legislators are well aware of the dangers of the world. The President is nearly assassinated; we need not convince them of the hostility in the land. Space is not the answer; space will not bring harmony to mankind in five easy installments. But it constantly diffuses the tension through reorientation of the psyche to larger questions than casual violence. Space will consume our energies like nothing else can. There is much

energy value in violence. Let's direct that energy to space. It's easy to see how it works. Space brings prestige; space brings the glory of the big bang; space entertains the masses; space keeps a nation on the forefront of science and technology; space brings economic power; space brings political power; there are crossovers to military technology; all this means that the benefits are enormous; we can colonize many worlds with one spaceship. The Third Petition will speak of Apollo-Soyuz. It will speak of behavior modification through modeling. The United States lead the world into the future, whatever doom or boom awaits it there. If we assault space with the bulk of our energy, will not much of the world follow our example if only to hedge the bet of receiving the rewards which we perceive ourselves to be receiving? Remember, when the United States declare the Space Revolution to be upon the land, the nation will proclaim the reasons for the Revolution in detail: money, power, prestige, pride. Certainly there is a taste of sin here! However, we cannot be other than this world until we blast off!

IV. Stimulus/Response: September 10, 1975

"Thank you for sending along the copies of the U.F.O.E.S.P. petitions supporting expanded space exploration; we hope they will have the desired effect. I have asked our publications department to place your organization on its list to receive a copy of each NASA issuance. Your continuing interest in and support of the space program is deeply appreciated." O.B. Lloyd, Jr., Director of Public Services, NASA, Washington, DC 20546 ... Naturally, they have been put on our mailing list, too! We can be sure that our petitions will be taken seriously by these people; and they can be a source of support for us. This is the second communication we have received from Mr. Lloyd. We have sent him three. These steps appear small but they are not. We must imprint ourselves on the memory of the public. By seeking to establish our presence amongst the agencies responsible for the higher functions of the government (Congress, NASA, The President, Governors, etc.), we magnify the impression we carry to the nation. We are not alone. There are powerful forces operating to achieve great use of Great Space. It will serve us well to link ourselves solidly together.

"Now that the American and Soviet astronauts who participated in the first joint manned space mission are safely back on earth, officials of the two countries are planning to meet later this year to discuss the possibility of more such projects. . . . In the years just ahead, both nations stand to make strides of potentially great importance in their space programs. . . . The Soviet Union . . . will enjoy a monopoly on manned spaceflight for most of the remainder of this decade. A number of Soyuz spacecraft of the sort that docked with Apollo will be launched. The United States . . . will . . . send men into space . . . [in] 1979, when the first of the space shuttles is scheduled to be orbited Because both the booster and the orbiter can be recovered and reused, the program calls for more than 500 flights over a 12-year period. Use of the shuttle will, for the first time, open to the Non-astronaut. Passengers may include astronomers, meteorologists, geologists, environmentalists, and other earth-resources experts. The ultimate scientific and economic payoff should be enormous. . . . We urge members of congress . . . to avoid a penny-wise and pound-foolish approach in dealing not only with the space shuttle but also with the several exciting unmanned space projects that are planned during the next few years. A case in point is the projected flight of unmanned, heavily instrumented capsules to the surface or vicinity of Venus, Mars, Jupiter, Saturn and Uranus. This may sound like far-out, dispensable stuff to the layman. But scientists hope that by gaining an understanding of the atmosphere on Venus and other planets, earthlings will be better able to comprehend and deal with their own complex environment. The Venusian atmosphere, according to the experts, has characteristics that make it especially promising for earth-related studies. Conceivably, the lessons learned will give scientists valuable clues to why the earth's climate appears to be cooling, raising fears that a catastrophic drop in world food production may begin within 35 years. If scientists are subsequently able to figure out ways to avoid or cope with climatic changes, the benefit to mankind will be incalculable. Yet the project, which involves sending two Pioneer capsules to Venus in 1978, costs substantially less than what it cost the United States to send three astronauts to rendezvous with the Russians in space. Pioneer has the full support of the

"Thank you for sending along the copies of the U.F.O.E.S.P. petitions supporting expanded space exploration; we hope they will have the desired effect. I have asked our publications department to place your organization on its list to receive a copy of each NASA issuance. Your continuing interest in and support of the space program is deeply appreciated." O.B. Lloyd, Jr., Director of Public Services, NASA, Washington, DC 20546 ... Naturally, they have been put on our mailing list, too! We can be sure that our petitions will be taken seriously by these people; and they can be a source of support for us. This is the second communication we have received from Mr. Lloyd. We have sent him three. These steps appear small but they are not. We must imprint ourselves on the memory of the public. By seeking to establish our presence amongst the agencies responsible for the higher functions of the government (Congress, NASA, The President, Governors, etc.), we magnify the impression we carry to the nation. We are not alone. There are powerful forces operating to achieve great use of Great Space. It will serve us well to link ourselves solidly together.

"Now that the American and Soviet astronauts who participated in the first joint manned space mission are safely back on earth, officials of the two countries are planning to meet later this year to discuss the possibility of more such projects. . . . In the years just ahead, both nations stand to make strides of potentially great importance in their space programs. . . . The Soviet Union . . . will enjoy a monopoly on manned spaceflight for most of the remainder of this decade. A number of Soyuz spacecraft of the sort that docked with Apollo will be launched. The United States . . . will . . . send men into space . . . [in] 1979, when the first of the space shuttles is scheduled to be orbited Because both the booster and the orbiter can be recovered and reused, the program calls for more than 500 flights over a 12-year period. Use of the shuttle will, for the first time, open to the Non-astronaut. Passengers may include astronomers, meteorologists, geologists, environmentalists, and other earth-resources experts. The ultimate scientific and economic payoff should be enormous. . . . We urge members of congress . . . to avoid a penny-wise and pound-foolish approach in dealing not only with the space shuttle but also with the several exciting unmanned space projects that are planned during the next few years. A case in point is the projected flight of unmanned, heavily instrumented capsules to the surface or vicinity of Venus, Mars, Jupiter, Saturn and Uranus. This may sound like far-out, dispensable stuff to the layman. But scientists hope that by gaining an understanding of the atmosphere on Venus and other planets, earthlings will be better able to comprehend and deal with their own complex environment. The Venusian atmosphere, according to the experts, has characteristics that make it especially promising for earth-related studies. Conceivably, the lessons learned will give scientists valuable clues to why the earth's climate appears to be cooling, raising fears that a catastrophic drop in world food production may begin within 35 years. If scientists are subsequently able to figure out ways to avoid or cope with climatic changes, the benefit to mankind will be incalculable. Yet the project, which involves sending two Pioneer capsules to Venus in 1978, costs substantially less than what it cost the United States to send three astronauts to rendezvous with the Russians in space . . . Pioneer has the full support of the National Academy of Science and the National Science Foundation. But the House has voted to eliminate most of the money requested for this year. Chances appear good that the Senate will vote to restore the funds, but unless the House can be prevailed on to change its mind, the Venus exploration project will die. This would be a mistake. . . . It is very important that members of Congress, in doing their cost-benefit analyses, take the long view.' The L.A. Times, Part II, Page 4, July 29, 1975—Thought you could Xerox this for your next letters to Washington." Anonymous Correspondent, mailed to national offices from somewhere in California (emphasis added) ... We wish to thank whoever sent us the clipping as we inadvertently lost our copy. Though we would have preferred to know by whom the clipping was sent, especially as a note was enclosed, we accept the omen for what it is. Even as space permeates the consciousness of the American people, so awareness of U.F.O.E.S.P. continues to grow and to disseminate throughout the body politic. Support for our efforts will be manifested in many ways: this mysterious letter is an example. But we must not lessen

our intention to make the fullest use of any support which comes our way. We harrangue, once again, on unity, from the smallest to the biggest part. Yes, take the long view! A Moonbase by '89!

"Despite recession and soaring inflation, the U.S. is still the "land of great opportunity" for budding tycoons, asserts one of the world's wealthiest men, J. Paul Getty. "If . . . I was young—and broke—America would be my launching pad to success," the surprisingly spry 82-year-old told the Enquirer in an exclusive interview . . . "I envy the opportunities of today's beginners," sighed the . . . self-made billionaire. . . . "The chances for a go-getter in the U.S. are greater now than they've ever been . . . " . . . And if Getty were starting all over, what fields would he investigate as the most likely in which to make a vast fortune? "Energy, for one," he quickly replied Then there's electronics. . . . Or the field of transport Lastly, his eyes glinting with enthusiasm, the financial genius listed the practically virgin territory of space exploration and research. "Remember, the rewards of Columbus' discoveries were enormous," Getty concluded. "But whatever I looked at—above all, it would be in America." The National Enquirer, Page 12, unknown date in 1975 prior to June 27—Maybe he'd invest time, or money in UFOESP? What do you think?" Ginette Stamitz, 302 "I" Street, Antioch, CA 94509 (emphasis added) Whether or not Mr. Getty would support us in any material way is a good question; to be honest, it is doubtful he would be interested. He has made his place in the world and it is not unlikely that he views the space frontier to be the concern of younger, more daring men and women than he. The point, however, is that he is right: there are millions and billions to be made in space. Though we cannot expect Mr. Getty to lend us assistance, that is not to say that we cannot expect any businessperson or firm to help us. Indeed, it may well be that our most potent organizing efforts for an expanded space program will be amongst the leaders of the private sector of the economy. To go from one business to another to seek support for the organization is an enormous question and will not be discussed here (it will be the subject of a future installment of "Progress...."). However, if our economic analysis is correct, and we have no reason to think it is not, then we should expect positive results from any campaign to include private enterprise in the push for space. The warriors explore the new frontiers; the merchants colonize them.

—————The Board of Governors, U.F.O.E.S.P.